

**San Mateo County Workshop  
May 13, 2008, 6pm-8pm  
San Mateo County Government Center  
Redwood City, CA**

Some 50 people were in attendance. Commissioners Sue Lempert and Adrienne Tissier offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

***The Three E's***

**How would you rank these three goals?**

|               | <b>Responses</b> |                   |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
|               | <b>Count</b>     | <b>Percentage</b> |
| Economy       | 40               | 33.06%            |
| Environment   | 39               | 32.23%            |
| Equity        | 42               | 34.71%            |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>121</b>       | <b>100%</b>       |

**Comments on goals**

- Environment number 1 because it will encompass the other 2
- 3 are interdependent
- Economy is dependant on transportation system

***Maintenance***

| <b>Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?</b>                               | <b>Responses</b> |                   |
|--|------------------|-------------------|
|  | <b>Count</b>     | <b>Percentage</b> |
| Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region | 25               | 65.79%            |
| Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region                            | 13               | 34.21%            |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>38</b>        | <b>100%</b>       |

**Maintenance Comments:**

- How come no bikeways? Not specific projects?
- Option B New Investments – New technology and new ideas, should be a priority
- How will seniors who don't live near transit get around. Need to address suburban areas.
- New technology – will solve most of our transportation problems – it is not worthwhile to maintain old stuff.
- Focus dollars on our system that is already in place
- If we only maintain what we have then we get no improvements – should look at new ideas like high speed rail. Is high-speed rail being looked at and is it eligible for \$30 billion?
- Need a third option: Personal Rapid Transit

| How much of our \$30M should be spent on maintenance? | Responses |             |
|---|-----------|-------------|
|   | Count     | Percentage  |
| Up to 25% (\$7.5 billion)                             | 21        | 53.85%      |
| Up to 50% (\$15 billion)                              | 13        | 33.33%      |
| Up to 75% (\$22.5 billion)                            | 4         | 10.26%      |
| 100% (\$30 billion)                                   | 1         | 2.56%       |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>39</b> | <b>100%</b> |

### *Congestion Relief*

| Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?  | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Option A: Investing in <u>highway</u> system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.) | 13        | 30.95%      |
| Option B: Investing in <u>public transit</u> options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving.                          | 23        | 54.76%      |
| Option C: Investing in <u>walking paths and bicycle lanes</u> to provide alternatives to driving.  | 6         | 14.29%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>42</b> | <b>100%</b> |

#### **Comments:**

- No example that public transit agencies reduce congestion
- Option B should include bicycle or peds; bikes need to be accommodated on transit
- Need PRT (personal rapid transit)
- Change behavior and demand for transportation close to work etc.
- Adding capacity to 101 not feasible, increase density
- FPI is a High priority, and transit new technology.
- SOV problem – put into transit and increase frequency
- What percentage drive alone, take transit etc?

| What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?             | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours                                   | 18        | 45%         |
| Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee | 3         | 7.50%       |
| Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries                   | 11        | 27.50%      |
| Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees                       | 6         | 15%         |
| Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas                      | 2         | 5%          |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>40</b> | <b>100%</b> |

#### **Comment:**

New Deli only allows trucks at night to reduce congestion, but pollution is a big issue at night.

## Focused Growth

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?

|  | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Option A: Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines | 27        | 72.97%      |
| Option B: Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes                            | 10        | 27.03%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>37</b> | <b>100%</b> |

### Comments:

- Poll results - Majority should invest near transit lines
- Santa Clara's high density near transit, but what kind of transit?
- Build airports near housing (PRT person)
- TOD disease from buildings
- Engineer did calculations and won't work
- Density will work if near transit – will move near transit
- Should use incentives for TODs
- Would not build homes near airports

## Access

**Transit Subsidy Based on Income:** Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

| There should be a subsidy for low-income riders. | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Strongly Agree                                   | 11        | 28.21%      |
| Agree  | 14        | 35.90%      |
| Neutral  | 5         | 12.82%      |
| Disagree   | 5         | 12.82%      |
| Strongly Disagree                                | 4         | 10.26%      |
| <b>Totals</b>                                    | <b>39</b> | <b>100%</b> |

### Comments:

- How can you tell if someone is low income?
- Why not subsidize transit for everyone?
- Universal fare card needed
- Need new technology
- Employers should subsidize use of transit

| I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability. | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Strongly Agree   | 5         | 12.82%      |
| Agree  | 6         | 15.38%      |
| Neutral  | 7         | 17.95%      |
| Disagree   | 11        | 28.21%      |
| Strongly Disagree  | 10        | 25.64%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>39</b> | <b>100%</b> |

## ***Emissions Reduction***

**Which of these should be a higher investment priority?**

|  | Responses |             |
|--|-----------|-------------|
|  | Count     | Percentage  |
| Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving. | 25        | 67.57%      |
| Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area.                  | 12        | 32.43%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>37</b> | <b>100%</b> |

### **Comments:**

- Focusing on young people that work, has not brought up disabled or elderly drivers.
- Transit costs too much, causing congestion
- Transit works
- Vehicle needs to be smaller
- AB 32 – Zoning reduce CO2 – building
- Don't use sound walls but put in more trees

**Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?**

|   | Responses |             |
|---|-----------|-------------|
|   | Count     | Percentage  |
| Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles                                      | 8         | 22.86%      |
| Provide more/cheaper public transit   | 9         | 25.71%      |
| Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use | 3         | 8.57%       |
| Build more bike paths and sidewalks   | 4         | 11.43%      |
| Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit               | 6         | 17.14%      |
| Support local traffic signal timing coordination                                  | 5         | 14.29%      |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>35</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**Comments:**

\$4 gal/gas having an effect

**Investment Tradeoffs**

| You have \$10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend. | Responses  |             |
|---|------------|-------------|
|   | Count      | Percentage  |
| Maintenance   | 58         | 19.21%      |
| Congestion Relief   | 63         | 20.86%      |
| Focus Growth  | 59         | 19.54%      |
| Access  | 71         | 23.51%      |
| Emissions Reduction   | 51         | 16.89%      |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>302</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**New Revenues**

| Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK) | Responses |             |
|---|-----------|-------------|
|   | Count     | Percentage  |
| Regional gas fee  | 20        | 23.81%      |
| Higher bridge toll  | 6         | 7.14%       |
| Road tolls  | 12        | 14.29%      |
| Vehicle registration fees   | 12        | 14.29%      |
| County transportation sales taxes   | 14        | 16.67%      |
| Other new revenues  | 14        | 16.67%      |
| No new fees or increases  | 6         | 7.14%       |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>84</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**Open Comments:**

| County    | Category          | Comment   |
|-----------|-------------------|---|
| San Mateo | Misc.             | Personal Rapid Transit again  |
| San Mateo | Planning process  | MCAC question – obtainable goals in 9 year period, need something new long-term for 2035. |
| San Mateo | Transit Fares     | Regional transportation fare  |
| San Mateo | Rail              | Euro style – high speed rail, works with Caltrain   |
| San Mateo | Taxes             | Need gas fees – keep price of gas high  |
| San Mateo | Personal Behavior | Gas rationing in WWII – walked everywhere, gas tax not percentage of use                  |

***Written Comments Submitted at Workshop:***

| <b>Category</b> | <b>County</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
|-----------------|---------------|---|
| Bikes           | San Mateo     | Bikeways need higher priority. Signed regional bikeways, safe bicycle crossings of freeways, more bike lanes and paths, bike traffic warning signs at freeway exit ramps. Bicycle use decreases carbon emissions, reduces obesity, improves cardiovascular system. Bicycles don't require large parking spaces. Programs to encourage students to bike to school are needed as are safe route access.   |
| Access          | San Mateo     | I am disabled, low income, and minority. I live in Belmont up a hill. There is no bus on Sunday or after 6.40 at night. I often have to walk 3 miles up the hill to get home or pay \$7 for a taxi. I don't have a cell phone. I often have to use a pay phone to call a cab at night and wait 20 minutes or more. Why not offer taxi service to the disabled and not just seniors? I was denied Ready Wheels. I take SamTrans, Caltrain, UTA, BART, and Muni with my RTC card. I need to get out of the area every day.  |
| Meeting         | San Mateo     | Questions were scripted and the "options" really didn't cover the [illegible word] issues   |
| Bikes           | San Mateo     | I am hoping that San Mateo and the other counties will look into spending a larger portion of the funding on walking and bike paths as this seems to be the "missing link" between transit and destinations; and funding for bike and walking paths costs so little in comparison to larger projects (freeway for example) where it would just be a drop in the bucket.   |
| HOV             | San Mateo     | <p>Dedicate a multiuse lane from Redwood City to SF on 101 to continue the HOV so that we can complete the system. Dedicate another multiuse lane as a HOT lane with the revenue going to transit. Managing capacity is a better alternative to removing congestion on 101. Provide incentives to create BRT in main street corridors like El Camino Real. Minor cross streets should be closed to create grade separation at a very low cost. All arterials should have bike lanes. We need a complete streets [illegible] for our bicycle program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management should be used to get more out of what we have. HOT/HOV etc provides a means to the end. Converting multicar lanes to bikeways and BOL increases capacity. Reducing the load on the roads will extend their lifetime</li> <li>• People who make bad choices should suffer</li> </ul> |
| Emissions       | San Mateo     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present investment goes to infrastructure that cause high emissions and have high maintenance costs. Invest in zero emissions modes</li> <li>• Congestion should be relieved through management and pricing</li> <li>• Emissions relief will come from providing choice [illegible] make responsible decisions</li> <li>• Focused growth for zero emissions communities like walk able commute will benefit our aging population and improve access. Building TOD without parking through [illegible] and management will make a big difference in housing costs and emissions</li> <li>• Instead of waiting for technological solutions [illegible] the sea levels</li> </ul>   |

|               |           |   |
|---------------|-----------|---|
|               |           | <p>rise we should enable existing proven zero emissions goals and add technology after its proven to not have side effects like oxygen depleted ocean zones and food riots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freight to rail will reduce emissions</li> <li>• Emissions reductions should conform to surroundings</li> </ul>  |
| Meeting       | San Mateo | <p>Surveys don't work because they restrict input to questions asked. MTC Public Information Staff should look at webstorm from BrightIdea.com to gather public input. This interactive tool allows citizens to rank each other's ideas, modify them, create new ones, and add comments. Please contact me for the demo link.</p>   |
| T2035 General | San Mateo | <p>What has passed history transportation forums taught us? Need more tech for 2035</p> <p>Partner with all nine counties to establish a regional transportation fare—a must for the future</p> <p>Private sector issue, partner with business for obtainable outcomes to connect ridership with business locations and jobs</p> <p>Sector off obtainable objectives in nine year segments to meet goals of 2035; thereby, measure accomplishments and accountability</p> <p>Are ok where do we consistently consider low income/people of color pay for express lanes. WE are sensitive—will be @20357</p> |
| Smart Growth  | San Mateo | <p>Connectivity between systems needs to be more fully addressed. The easier it is for people to access public transit with less wait time between connections, the more likely people will be to take it.</p> <p>People also need more information about the transit they are choosing to take at the point of boarding (i.e. the reader boards)</p>   |

***Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:***

| <b>1.) How did you get here this evening?</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Drove   | 29               | 65.91%      |
| Public Transportation                         | 8                | 18.18%      |
| Carpool                                       | 2                | 4.55%       |
| Bike  | 1                | 2.27%       |
| Walked  | 4                | 9.09%       |
| <b>Totals</b>                                 | <b>44</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>2.) How long did it take you to get here?</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Less than five minutes                           | 1                | 2.22%       |
| Five to 10 minutes                               | 7                | 15.56%      |
| Ten to 30 minutes                                | 21               | 46.67%      |
| More than 30 minutes                             | 16               | 35.56%      |
| <b>Totals</b>                                    | <b>45</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>3.) How would you describe yourself?</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Business Advocate                           | 6                | 8.22%       |
| Environmental Advocate                      | 8                | 10.96%      |
| Community Advocate                          | 16               | 21.92%      |
| Government/Agency Staff                     | 18               | 24.66%      |
| Concerned Individual                        | 20               | 27.40%      |
| Social Justice Advocate                     | 3                | 4.11%       |
| Elected Official                            | 2                | 2.74%       |
| <b>Totals</b>                               | <b>73</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>4.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting?</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Flyer  | 14               | 30.43%      |
| Website  | 1                | 2.17%       |
| Email  | 23               | 50%         |
| Other  | 8                | 17.39%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>46</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>5.) Do you use public transportation regularly? (one to two times a week)</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Yes  | 24               | 52.17%      |
| No   | 22               | 47.83%      |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>46</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**6.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past?**

|               | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| Yes           | 32               | 69.57%      |
| No            | 14               | 30.43%      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>46</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**7.) What County do you live in?**

|               | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| Alameda       | 1                | 2.27%       |
| Contra Costa  | 1                | 2.27%       |
| Marin         | 1                | 2.27%       |
| Napa          | 0                | 0%          |
| San Francisco | 2                | 4.55%       |
| San Mateo     | 34               | 77.27%      |
| Santa Clara   | 4                | 9.09%       |
| Solano        | 1                | 2.27%       |
| Sonoma        | 0                | 0%          |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>44</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**8.) What is your gender?**

|               | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| Male          | 27               | 64.29%      |
| Female        | 15               | 35.71%      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>42</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**9.) Are you Hispanic/Latino?**

|               | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| Yes           | 8                | 18.18%      |
| No            | 36               | 81.82%      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>44</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**10.) How do you identify yourself (click all that apply)?**

|                         | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| White                   | 27               | 67.50%      |
| Chinese                 | 6                | 15%         |
| Vietnamese              | 0                | 0%          |
| Asian/Indian            | 2                | 5%          |
| Black/African American  | 1                | 2.50%       |
| Japanese                | 0                | 0%          |
| Filipino                | 0                | 0%          |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 1                | 2.50%       |
| Other Asian             | 1                | 2.50%       |
| Other Race              | 2                | 5%          |
| <b>Totals</b>           | <b>40</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>11.) What is your age?</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 24 years and under            | 0                | 0%          |
| Between 25 and 59             | 30               | 66.67%      |
| Over 60                       | 15               | 33.33%      |
| <b>Totals</b>                 | <b>45</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

***Meeting Evaluation Questions Asked at Workshops:***

| <b>35.) I had the opportunity to provide comments.</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree   | 10               | 55.56%      |
| Agree  | 5                | 27.78%      |
| Neutral  | 1                | 5.56%       |
| Disagree   | 1                | 5.56%       |
| Strongly Disagree                                      | 1                | 5.56%       |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>18</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>36.) I found the meeting useful and informative.</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree  | 6                | 31.58%      |
| Agree   | 8                | 42.11%      |
| Neutral   | 2                | 10.53%      |
| Disagree  | 2                | 10.53%      |
| Strongly Disagree                                       | 1                | 5.26%       |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>19</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>37.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives.</b> | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree  | 2                | 10%         |
| Agree   | 14               | 70%         |
| Neutral   | 3                | 15%         |
| Disagree  | 0                | 0%          |
| Strongly Disagree   | 1                | 5%          |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>20</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>38.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.</b> | <b>Responses</b> |        |
|---|------------------|--------|
| Strongly Agree  | 2                | 10.53% |

|                   |           |             |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Agree             | 9         | 47.37%      |
| Neutral           | 3         | 15.79%      |
| Disagree          | 4         | 21.05%      |
| Strongly Disagree | 1         | 5.26%       |
| <b>Totals</b>     | <b>19</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**39.) A quality discussion of key issues took place.**

|                   | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 4                | 19.05%      |
| Agree             | 3                | 14.29%      |
| Neutral           | 7                | 33.33%      |
| Disagree          | 6                | 28.57%      |
| Strongly Disagree | 1                | 4.76%       |
| <b>Totals</b>     | <b>21</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**40.) I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.**

|                   | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 3                | 14.29%      |
| Agree             | 8                | 38.10%      |
| Neutral           | 6                | 28.57%      |
| Disagree          | 2                | 9.52%       |
| Strongly Disagree | 2                | 9.52%       |
| <b>Totals</b>     | <b>21</b>        | <b>100%</b> |

**41.) There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.**

|                   | <b>Responses</b> |             |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 14               | 60.87%      |
| Agree             | 8                | 34.78%      |
| Neutral           | 1                | 4.35%       |
| Disagree          | 0                | 0%          |
| Strongly Disagree | 0                | 0%          |
| <b>Totals</b>     | <b>23</b>        | <b>100%</b> |